

REMARKS

In response to the Office action identified above, please accept the following remarks.

5

1. Correction of the drawings:

Figs. 2 and 3 are now properly corrected to include
ditches 73 and 91 to indicate the feature claimed in
claims 12 and 25. No new matter has been introduced.
In addition, claims 11 and 24 have been canceled and
the feature claimed therein is no longer in need of
consideration. Allowance of the corrected drawings is
respectfully requested.

15

2. Correction of the specification:

The applicant respectfully requests amending the
specification of the present application to correct
all typographic errors of not having necessary space
between two words in paragraphs [0006], [0020] and
[0022].

20

An appropriate correction has also been made in
paragraphs [0020] and [0022] of the specification to
correspond with the corrected drawings.

25

In addition, the title has been corrected as
suggested by the Examiner to form a description that
is clearly indicative of the invention to which the
claims are directed. Allowance of all the correction
is hereby requested.

30

3. Objection to claims 14 and 26:

In claim 14, the typographical error of no space between "regionof" in line 2 of page 11, should be corrected.

In claim 26, the typographic error of no space between "thantwice" of line 2 of claim 26, should be corrected.

10 Response:

Claims 14 and 26 have been amended to overcome this objection. Reconsideration of the amended claims 14 and 26 is respectfully requested.

15

4. Rejection of claims 1-13 and 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph:

Claims 1-13 and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

25 Claim 1 recites the limitation "the predetermined region of bottom substrate" in line 13. Since there is no earlier recitation of "predetermined region of bottom substrate" it is not clear as to what element the limitation is referring. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

30

Claims 2-13 are rejected for being dependent on claim

1.

Claims 23-25, recite a limitation "the predetermined region". Since there is no earlier recitation of
5 "predetermined region", it is not clear as to what element the limitation is referring. There is insufficient basis for this limitation in the claim.

Response:

10

Claim 1 has been amended to delete the phrase "the predetermined region" to overcome this rejection. Reconsideration of the amended claim 1 is respectfully requested.

15

Claims 2-10, and 12-13 are dependent on the amended claim 1 and should be allowed if the amended claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 2-10, and 12-13 is politely requested.

20

Claims 23 and 25 have been amended to replace the limitation "the predetermined region" with the limitation "the active region" according to the base claim 14. There is no longer insufficient antecedent
25 basis for the limitation in the amended claims 23 and 25. Reconsideration of the amended claims 23 and 25 is respectfully requested.

Claims 11 and 24 have been canceled and are therefore
30 no longer in need of consideration.

5. Rejection of claims 1, 3, 9-11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C.

102(e):

Claims 1, 3, 9-11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Park et al. (US 2002/0155320), for reasons of record, as recited on pages 4-5 in the Office action (part of paper no. 20040104).

Response:

10

Claim 1 has been amended by introducing the allowable subject matter disclosed in claim 12. No new matter has been introduced. In the amended claim 1, the OLED is limited to further comprise at least a ditch within the bottom electrode. Allowance of the amended claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 9-10 and 13 are dependent on the amended claim 1 and should be allowed if the amended claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 3, 9-10 and 13 is politely requested. In addition, claim 11 has been canceled and is no longer in need of consideration.

6. Rejection of claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

25

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eida et al. (US 5909081), in view of Taniguchi et al. (US 5239228), for reasons of record, as recited on pages 5-8 in the Office action (part of paper no. 20040104).

30

Response:

Claim 1 has been amended to overcome this rejection. The amended claim 1 introduces the allowable subject matter disclosed in claim 12 to limit the OLED to further
5 comprise at least a ditch within the bottom electrode. No new matter has been introduced. Allowance of the amended claim 1 is respectfully requested.

10 Claims 2-9 are dependent on the amended claim 1 and should be allowed if the amended claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 2-9 is politely requested.

7. Rejection of claims 14-19, 22-24 and 27 under 35
15 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 14-19, 22-24 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of
20 Rajeswaran et al. (US 6614171), for reasons of record, as recited on pages 8-11 in the Office action (part of paper no. 20040104).

Response:

25

First, claim 14 has been amended to correct the typographic error, as mentioned in the previous response to the objection to claim 14. No new matter has been introduced.

30

Second, the Applicant intends to point out the difference among the amended claim 14 of the present

application and the references cited. The amended claim 14 of the present application is repeated below:

Claim 14: An organic light emitting device that
5 comprises at least two organic light emitting diodes (OLEDs), the organic light emitting device comprising:
a bottom substrate comprising at least two device regions, and a *segmented region between two adjacent device regions positioned on an upper surface of the*
10 *bottom substrate*, each device region comprising a bottom electrode positioned on the device region, an organic layer positioned on an active region of the device region, and a top electrode positioned on the organic layer;
15 a top substrate positioned parallel with the bottom substrate, a lower surface of the top substrate comprising at least two first regions corresponding to the device regions of the bottom substrate, at least one second region corresponding to the segmented region
20 of the bottom substrate, and a plurality of first ditches positioned within each first region of the top substrate; and
a sealing material positioned on a spot glue region of the bottom substrate and outside each active region
25 for binding the top substrate and the bottom substrate together;
wherein the first ditches are used to prevent the sealing material from overflowing into the segmented region and each active region of the bottom substrate
30 and affecting normal operation of each OLED.

As disclosed in the amended claim 14, the organic

light emitting device has a segmented region between two device regions. The segmented region is not only used to isolate each OLED, but also provides a position for performing a cutting process to separate each OLED after completing the organic light emitting device (please see paragraph [0021] in the specification).

Rajeswaran et al. teaches a predetermined gap spx, spy positioned between pixels (OLEDs) of a display (Fig. 1 and Col. 3, lines 12-13). However, the gap spx, spy taught by Rajeswaran et al. cannot be read as the segmented region disclosed in the present application. The gap spx, spy is merely used to isolate pixels, and is impossibly used as the position for performing the cutting process to separate each OLED on a large area display. Therefore, the Applicant believes that Rajeswaran et al.'s disclosure is absolutely different from the amended claim 14 of the present application, and one of ordinary skill cannot combine the invention of Rajeswaran et al. and the single OLED structure disclosed by Park et al. to accomplish the applicant's invention. Reconsideration of the amended claim 14 is politely requested.


As claims 15-19, 22-23 and 27 are dependent upon the amended claim 14, they should be allowed if the amended claim 14 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 15-19, 22-23 and 27 is therefore requested. In addition, claim 24 has been canceled and is no longer in need of consideration.

8. Introduction to claim 28:

Claim 28 is introduced by merging claims 14 and 26. No new matter is introduced. Claim 28 includes all of the limitations of the base claim 14 and the allowable subject matter of claim 26, disclosing an organic light emitting device comprising a segmented region between two adjacent device regions, and particularly limiting a width of each first ditch to less than half a width of the segmented region. Allowance of claim 28 is hereby requested.

Sincerely yours,

15

Date: 5/26/2004

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526
P.O. BOX 506
Merrifield, VA 22116
U.S.A.

20

e-mail: winstonhsu@naipo.com.tw

(please contact me by e-mail if you need a telephone communication
and I will return your call promptly.)

25